

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 - 9 have been amended. Claim 15 is added.

No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Response to Claim Objection

Claim 7 is objected to as allegedly being of improperly dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Specifically, the Examiner states that claim 7 appears to have elements of both independent claim and a claim dependent on claim 5.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's objection is not understood. Claim 7 refers back to, and incorporates the subject matter of independent claim 5. Claim 7 includes the additional feature of an image forming portion, which is not included in claim 5. Therefore, claim 7 further limits the subject matter of claim 5. Accordingly, claim 7 is a dependent claim as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c).

For clarification, claim 7 is amended to recite an image forming portion in which execution of the processing is based on the control of the processing request data by the execution control means of the electronic money processor.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to claim 7.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as

allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as invention.

Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the use of the phrases "an amount of electronic money" , "the electronic money" and "the received electronic money" are inconsistent, and lack antecedent basis in claims 1-5 and 8.

Claims 1-5 and 8 have been amended for clarification.

The Examiner further states that it is unclear how the electronic data and electronic money are attached, and what is meant by the term attached within the context of an electronic transmission of data.

Claims 1-5 and 8 have been amended to clarify that it is electronic money data, not the electronic money, that is attached together with the processing data.

Applicant submits that the meaning of the term "attached" in the recitation "the processing data and the electronic money data are attached together" is clear and self-explanatory.

FIG. 3, which illustrates an example of the JOB data, provides an exemplary embodiment of attaching together the processing data and the electronic money data.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Response to Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103, on the basis of the Aiyama patent (U.S. 7,075,666, hereinafter "Aiyama") in view of the Berson et al. patent (U.S. 6,938,154, hereinafter " Berson").

The present disclosure relates to making payment for information processing by electronic money. In one exemplary embodiment, a personal computer PC1 adds the electronic money data to the print data to form JOB data, and transmits the JOB data to a printer. FIG. 3 illustrates an exemplary configuration of the JOB data. Referring to FIG. 3, the JOB data includes header information a, electronic money data, header information b, a print control command and print data. According to the exemplary configuration illustrated in FIG. 3, the electronic money data can include:

- information on the electronic money itself,
- information on the issuer of the electronic money,
- information on the date and time of issuance of the electronic money,
- information on the amount of the electronic money, and
- information on the use record of the electronic money.

The Examiner has correctly conceded that Aiyama does not disclose processing data and electronic money data that are attached together. However, the Examiner cites Berson as allegedly remedying the deficiencies of Aiyama.

Claim 1, amended for clarification, now recites receiving, through a network, data including both processing data to be information-processed and electronic money data including an amount of electronic money that is necessary for payment for information processing of said processing data and validity information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid, wherein the processing data and the electronic money data are attached together.

Berson relates to network devices that can be configured to enforce policies. Specifically, Berson teaches a printer, capable of engaging in electronic cash protocols, that could accept digital cash along with a document over the network to

pay for print services.

Applicant submits that Berson does not teach or suggest that the processing data and the electronic money data are attached together, where the electronic money data includes an amount of electronic money that is necessary for payment for information processing of said processing data and validity information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid, as described in claim 1.

Berson only teaches a printer that accepts digital cash along with a document to be printed. However, Berson does not explicitly teach or suggest whether the digital cash accepted along with the document by the printer includes validity information for determining whether digital cash data is valid. Furthermore, Berson does not inherently teach or suggest that the digital cash includes validity information for determining whether digital cash data is valid. For example, the digital cash in Berson may be accepted by the printer regardless whether the digital cash is valid. As another example, the digital cash may be determined to be valid prior being sent to the printer along with the document. In at least these two examples, the digital cash in Berson does not include validity information for determining whether digital cash data is valid.

For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that Berson does not teach the subject matter of claim 1 that is acknowledged to be missing from Aiyama. Consequently, any possible combination of the teachings of the two patents cannot lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to the claimed subject matter.

For at least these same reasons, independent claims 2-5 and 8 are submitted to be likewise patentable over the disclosure of Aiyama and Berson. By virtue of

their dependency from these patentably distinct claims, dependent claims 6, 7 and 9-14 are also submitted to be allowable over the references.

New Claim

Claim 15 is added to describe an information processing method disclosed in the specification. Claim 15 is patentable at least because it recites features similar to those of claim 1. Specifically, any possible combination of Aiyama and Berson does not teach or suggest electronic money data that includes validity information for determining whether the electronic money data is valid, as described in claim 15.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested and such action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of present application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: April 10, 2008

By: 

James A. LaBarre

Registration No. 28632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703.836.6620